

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 278

CG 016 857

AUTHOR Crouch, Joyce G.; Powell, Mary L.  
TITLE Sex, Sex Role Identity, Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction.  
PUB DATE 24 Mar 83  
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (29th, Atlanta, GA, March 23-26, 1983).  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Employee Attitudes; Employees; \*Employer Employee Relationship; \*Job Satisfaction; \*Leadership Styles; Sex Differences; \*Sex Role; Supervisory Methods

## ABSTRACT

Managerial behavior is often conceptualized as consisting of two independent dimensions, i.e., task behavior and relationship behavior, concern for production and concern for people, and initiating structure and consideration. To examine the relationship between subordinates' sex, subordinates' sex role identity, subordinates' perception of supervisor's leadership style, supervisors' sex role identities, supervisors' perceptions of their own leadership styles, and subordinates' satisfaction; and also to determine predictors of subordinates' job satisfaction, male supervisors (N=9) in a university housekeeping unit and subordinate workers (17 females and 25 males) completed measures assessing sex role orientation, perceptions of supervisors, leadership style, and job satisfaction. Results of statistical analyses include: (1) supervisors' assessments of their leadership styles were related to five measures of subordinates' job satisfaction (i.e., work, pay, supervision, co-workers and job in general); (2) supervisors' sex role identification was related to subordinates' sex role identification and job satisfaction; (3) a perceived leadership style of consideration predicated six measures of job satisfaction (i.e., work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, co-workers, and job in general). Because of the small sample and because data were obtained from a single job category, findings in this study, which have not been previously reported, should be interpreted with caution. (WAS)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED233278

Sex, Sex Role Identity, Leadership  
Style and Job Satisfaction  
J. G. Crouch and M. L. Powell  
Appalachian State University

Paper Presented at Annual Meeting  
Southeastern Psychological Association  
March 24, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE  
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*J. G. Crouch*  
*Mary L. Powell*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 016857

## Sex, Sex Role Identity, Leadership

### Style and Job Satisfaction

Historically managerial behavior has been viewed as primarily task oriented or instrumental and has been associated with the stereotyped masculine sex role. Adjectives such as assertive, achieving, competitive, rational, and independent have been used to describe appropriate characteristics for both men and managers (Bass, 1981). In contrast, females have been characterized as noncompetitive, person-oriented, emotional, intuitive, and dependent. The stereotyped feminine sex role was thus seen as social/emotional or expressive (Spence & Helmrick, 1978).

Today, however, managerial behavior is often conceptualized as consisting of two independent dimensions: (a) task behavior and relationship behavior (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977), (b) concern for production and concern for people (Blake & Mouton, 1964), and (c) initiating structure and consideration (Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957).

Conceptions of sex role stereotypes are also changing. Some psychologists have proposed that masculine and feminine attributes are not opposites but are complementary (Bem, 1974, 1977; Constantinople, 1973; Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975). Persons of either sex can rate high in each dimension. A person who has a high degree of both masculine and feminine sex stereotyped characteristics would be considered androgynous (Kelly & Worell, 1977).

The masculinity dimension of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978)

suggest aspects of task behavior, concern for production, and initiating structure while the femininity dimension suggests relationship behavior, concern for people, and consideration oriented behavior. The androgyny dimension suggested individuals whose leadership style is both task and relationship oriented.

Alice Sargent, in The Androgynous Manager (1981), applies the concept of androgyny directly to the managerial or administrative situation and states that effective managers should be androgynous. She concludes that the effective manager should be able to behave flexibly incorporating the positive characteristics of both the male and female sex role stereotype.

A number of studies have found that leaders who rated high in both task and relationship dimensions were more likely to be judged effective by their superiors and to have desirable effects on group productivity and morale (Fleishman & Harris, 1962; Halpin, 1954; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Oaklander & Fleishman, 1964). Many studies which examined the relationship between leadership style and subordinate job satisfaction have reported positive effects of supportive leadership on attitudes and satisfaction of subordinates (Argyle, Gardner, & Cioffe, 1958; Baumgartel, 1956, 1957; Danielson & Maier, 1957; Hemphill, 1957; Indik, Seashore, & Georgopoulos, 1960; Patchen, 1960; Spector, Clark, & Glickman, 1960).

On the other hand, several studies related to the sex role identities of managers have found that "good" or successful managers were perceived to have characteristics associated with the masculine sex role stereotype. Schein (1973, 1975) found that both male and female middle managers described successful middle managers as having characteristics, attitudes, and temperaments more commonly ascribed to men in general than women in general.

The hypothesis of Powell and Butterfield (1979) that undergraduate and graduate business students would view the "good" manager as being androgynous was not supported. Instead the "good" manager was described in masculine terms. Inderlied and Powell (1979) found that undergraduate and graduate business students, home economists, and technical trainers preferred a "masculine team" manager. Their results also suggest that dimensions of sex role identity and leadership style are independent concepts.

The researchers listed above sought to determine the views of a number of people concerning the sex role identities of effective managers. None of them has attempted to study employees and their own unit supervisors in an ongoing organization. However, it seems logical that certain aspects of leader effectiveness can be determined only through studies of employee satisfaction in actual work groups.

No studies are reported in the literature that examine differences in job satisfaction that might result from the interaction of sex or sex role identities of employees with sex role identities of their supervisors, although Field and Caldwell (1979) found that there were significant differences in the job satisfaction of librarians depending upon the interaction between their sex and the sex of their supervisors.

The relationship between sex and job satisfaction has been extensively studied, and the findings have been somewhat contradictory. Hulin and Smith (1964) found that there was a tendency for female workers to be less satisfied with their jobs than their male counterparts. They concluded, however, that the crucial factor was not sex per se but rather the entire constellation of factors which themselves covary with sex such as pay, job level, and promotional opportunities within a company.

Several researchers have examined the relationship of sex of the supervisor and supervisory leadership style to subordinate job satisfaction. Petty and Lee (1975) studied employees in nonacademic divisions of a university. Subordinates with supervisors higher in consideration had greater satisfaction with work. The correlation was higher for subordinates with female supervisors than for those with male supervisors. In contrast, the data collected by Osborn and Vicars (1976) in two mental health institutions revealed no consistent relationship of leader sex with either perceived leader behavior (consideration or initiating structure) or subordinate satisfaction.

The purpose of the present research was to investigate the relationship of subordinate sex, subordinate sex role identity, subordinate's perceptions of their supervisor's leadership styles, sex role identities of these supervisors, supervisor's perceptions of their own leadership styles, and job satisfaction of subordinates. Also an attempt has been made to determine which of these variables would be the best predictor(s) of subordinate job satisfaction.

#### Method

Sample and Procedures. Two sets of packets were coded to match supervisors with subordinates and mailed to all employees in the housekeeping and food services units in a regional university. These groups were selected because the jobs were at the entry level and required approximately equal skills. The total potential sample was composed of 18 supervisors and 115 workers - 10 supervisors and 73 workers in housekeeping and 8 supervisors and 42 workers in food services.

The return rate was considered sufficient for analysis only for the housekeeping unit. Ninety percent of supervisors, and 57% of subordinates of those supervisors returned completed forms. In food services, 25% of supervisors and 26% of subordinates returned completed packets, but only 14% of the subordinates responding were within the units of the supervisors who responded. Therefore, only the data from the housekeeping unit were analyzed. The final sample consisted of nine male supervisors and 42 workers, 17 females and 25 males.

Measures. Two different packets were prepared to obtain measures of sex role orientation and perceptions of supervisors; leadership style from both supervisors and subordinates job satisfaction of the subordinates. In addition, sex of the subordinate was established from an item on a personal data questionnaire.

Sex role orientation was measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). From this self-report scale were derived masculinity (M), femininity (F), and masculinity-femininity (M-F) scores for both supervisors and subordinates. Items on the M scale refer largely to instrumental, agentic characteristics while items on the F scale refer largely to expressive, communal attributes. The M-F scale contains items that could be classified as agentic, communal or a combination of both. Specific items denoting masculinity were very independent, very active, very competitive, can make decisions easily, never gives up easily, self confident, feels very superior, and stands up well under pressure. Femininity was measured by the items--very emotional, able to devote self completely to others, very gentle, very helpful to others, very kind, very aware of feelings of others, very warm in relations with others, and

very understanding of others. Masculinity-femininity was tapped by these items--very aggressive, very dominant, not at all excitable in a major crisis, very worldly, indifferent to others' approval, feelings not easily hurt, never cries, and very little need for security. Sex role identity was established for the supervisors and the subordinates from scores on both the masculinity and femininity scales: low on both--undifferentiated; low on masculinity, high on femininity-feminine; high on masculinity, low on femininity-masculine; high on both-androgynous.

This measure of sex role identity was chosen rather than the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974, 1977) for two reasons. First, Bem's inventory contains negative items such as "flatterable," "jealous," and "gullible," while the PAQ was composed only of items judged to be acceptable in one or both sexes. Second, the psychometric properties of the PAQ and the measures of leadership style and job satisfaction are similar in that scores are interpreted without reference to sex.

To assess subordinate's perception of their supervisor's leadership styles, a short form of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Halpin & Winer, 1957) was utilized. This instrument consists of 30 items from an 80 item questionnaire. Fifteen of these are scored on Consideration and 15 are scored on Initiating Structure. Consideration refers to leader behaviors concerned with the comfort and well being of followers while Initiating Structure refers to leader behaviors concerned with role definition and letting followers know what is expected.

The reliabilities of these short scales have been found to be sufficiently high for practical use with odd-even estimates of .87 for Consideration and .75 for Initiating Structure and .93 for Consideration

and .86 for Initiating Structure when the Spearman-Brown formula is applied to correct for attenuation. The two scales are correlated to a moderate degree but are sufficiently independent to permit their use as measures of different kinds of behavior.

Supervisors' perceptions of their own leadership styles were assessed by using a short form of a revision of the LBDQ (Sergiovanni, Metzcus, & Burden, 1969). These investigators identified 58 items on the LBDQ which differentiated in their correlations with two types of factors, system orientation and personal orientation (Brown, 1967) by more than .20. In addition they related these dimensions to the managerial grid concept (Blake & Mouton, 1964). The short form used was an adaptation of this revision (Pheiffer & Jones, 1969).

Subordinates' satisfaction with the work itself, pay, supervision, opportunities for promotion, co-workers and the job in general were measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). The JDI is an adjective checklist on which employees are asked to respond with "yes," "?," or "no" to a series of adjective describing their satisfaction with the first five aspects of job satisfactions listed above. Extensive validity and reliability data have been accumulated on the JDI. This information is summarized by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). The job-in-general scale is an experimental scale designed to measure overall job satisfaction.

### Results

The correlations, means, and standard deviation for all variables in the present study are shown in Table I. An examination of the means indicates that supervisors rate themselves higher on the people dimension

than the task dimension and that the workers rate their supervisors higher on consideration than initiating structure. Mean ratings on the job satisfaction measures indicate that workers are more satisfied with co-workers, over-all jobs, and supervision than with work, opportunities for promotion, and pay. Although the leadership styles, sex role identification, and job satisfaction variables are moderately intercorrelated within the category, the relationships across categories are worth examining.

Supervisors' assessments of their leadership styles were related to five of the job satisfaction measures, suggesting that workers whose supervisors considered themselves people-oriented tended to be more satisfied with work, pay, supervision, co-workers, and job in general. While Leadership Style: Task was related only to the JDI Job in General measure, it was negatively related to all three sex role identification measures of the supervisors, indicating that supervisors who score lower on sex stereotyped characteristics tend to be more task oriented.

Besides relating to supervisors' leadership styles, supervisors' sex role identification was related to their subordinates' sex role identification and job satisfaction. Workers whose supervisors had higher masculinity-femininity scores (more aggressive, dominant, unemotional, etc.) or masculine scores (more active, competitive, self confident, etc.) tended to rate themselves lower on the masculinity-femininity scale while those whose supervisors had higher masculinity or higher femininity ratings scored higher on the femininity scale. An examination of job satisfaction suggests that masculine sex role identification of supervisors is related to job satisfaction of subordinates. Specifically

masculinity scores of supervisors correlated significantly with subordinates' job satisfaction with work, supervision, and co-workers.

While the leadership styles as rated by the supervisor and the supervisors' sex role identification related to subordinates' sex role identification and job satisfaction, the separate sex role identification ratings of the subordinates were unrelated to job satisfaction. However, sex and sex role categories were weakly related.

The variables most highly related to job satisfaction were the leadership styles as perceived by the subordinates. In fact, all correlations between the job satisfaction measures and both a considerate and initiating leadership style were significant.

As Table I further indicates, scores on subtests within each of the measures were significantly related. Since there were only nine supervisors, the intercorrelations were considered unreliable. However, the intercorrelations between subtest scores are of such a magnitude as to imply that they are not independent measures. For example, over 60% of variance in either measure of perceived leadership style is accounted for by the other, and about 30% of variance in masculine or feminine sex role identification is accounted for by scores on the other measure. However, sex was not significantly related to sex role identification measures, nor were male subordinates significantly higher on self-ascribed masculine or lower on self-ascribed feminine traits than female subordinates.

To examine the relative importance of the variables as contributors to the variance in job satisfaction, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was utilized. For each job satisfaction variable the four first variables from the regression analysis are presented in Table 2 along with

multiple correlation, the squared multiple correlation, the change in the multiple correlation by the addition of the variable, the beta weight and the adjusted squared multiple correlation. It was found that perceived leadership style: consideration was the only variable in all six regressions to predict job satisfaction--work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, co-workers, and job in general. Not only was each job satisfaction regression composed of a different set of factors, but there was also a range in the magnitude of the adjusted squared multiple correlation from .28 for satisfaction with co-workers to .57 for satisfaction with the job in general.

The results show that perceived leadership style: consideration was the initial variable in five regressions. This variable accounted for 55.7% of variance in satisfaction with supervision, 40.2% of variance in satisfaction with job in general, 33.7% of variance in satisfaction with present work, 22.1% of variance in satisfaction with pay, 20.8% of variance in satisfaction with opportunities for promotion, and 3.2% of variance in satisfaction with co-workers.

- The results also revealed that supervisors' ratings of leadership style: people accounted for about 14% of the variance in satisfaction with co-workers and was the initial variable in the regression. In addition, supervisors' leadership style: people accounted for variance in job satisfaction as follows: work, 10.9%; pay, 2.8%; and job in general, 7.4%.

When entered into the regression after a measure of supervisor's consideration, subordinates' sex and sex role identification accounted for additional variance in job satisfaction. Adding sex as a variable

increased the multiple correlation coefficient of satisfaction with work by 2.7% and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion by 9.4%, indicating higher satisfaction for males. In addition, sex role identification accounted for 11.2% of the variance in satisfaction with job in general. A one-way analysis of variance ( $F = 3.28$ ,  $p = .03$ ) and Scheffe multiple range test revealed that androgynous subordinates (those scoring high on both masculine and feminine PAQ scales) were more satisfied with the job in general than undifferentiated workers (those scores low on masculine and feminine PAQ scales), while subordinates with either feminine and masculine sex role identification were intermediate in satisfaction with the job in general.

In second through fourth positions in the regression, supervisors' sex role identification scores accounted for additional variance in job satisfaction. Masculine sex role of supervisors added 3.0% to workers' satisfaction with work and 2.1% with supervision. As indicated by the negative beta weight, low feminine sex role orientation of supervisors added 15.0% to workers' satisfaction with pay; however, higher feminine role orientation added 14.5% to satisfaction with co-workers.

Table 3 presents a summary of changes in the multiple correlation for all variables which entered the stepwise regression on each job satisfaction measure as one of the first four variables or added more than 1% to the multiple correlation coefficient. It must be noted that intercorrelations among variables and position of the variable in the regression add to the difficulty of interpretation; however, several additional implications can be gleaned from this information.

The stepwise multiple regression for satisfaction with supervision and co-workers included no additional variables which added 1% to be squared multiple correlation. On the other hand, the regressions for satisfaction with pay, promotion, and overall job contained a set of variables which reveal more clearly the possible influence of sex role identification upon job satisfaction. Supervisors' sex role identification scores were positive and negative factors in predicting job satisfaction. Their PAQ M-F scores contributed positively to the variance to subordinates' satisfaction with pay and overall job but negatively to satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. The PAQ M scores added positively to worker satisfaction with work, opportunities for promotion, and supervision. Their PAQ F scores added positively to satisfaction with co-workers but negatively to satisfaction with pay and supervision.

Sex role identification measures of workers added 1% or more to seven of the squared multiple correlation. Subordinates PAQ M-F added positively to satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and negatively to satisfaction with pay, just the opposite of the contributions of supervisors' PAQ M-F.

### Discussion

Despite the fact that small sample and the moderate return rate cast doubt upon the reliability of the findings, the results of the study confirm many of the findings reported in previous studies. Hence, the findings of the present study not previously reported should be considered carefully, since few investigations have attempted to study workers' job satisfaction in relationship to their perceived leadership style, sex,

and sex role identification and their supervisor's sex role identification and reported leadership style.

Since two measures of leadership style were included and entered into a stepwise multiple regression analysis, it seems logical that the subordinates' perception of their supervisors' considerate leadership style is the single most important predictor of job satisfaction. While people-oriented leadership style, as judged by supervisors themselves, correlated significantly with job satisfaction, as previous studies (Argyle, Gardner, & Cioffi, 1958; Baumgartel, 1956, 1957; Danielson & Maier, 1957; Hemphill, 1957; Indik, Seashore, & Georgopoulos, 1960; Patchen, 1960; Spector, Clark, & Glickman, 1960) indicated, it was most important in the present study in predicting satisfaction with work and co-workers. While some studies have reported positive relationships between the job satisfaction and task-oriented and initiating leadership styles, the present study suggests that much of the positive correlation between these variables could reflect the intercorrelations between the measures of leadership style. However, the negative beta weight of both supervisors' task-oriented leadership style and workers' perceptions of initiating leadership style in the job satisfaction regressions deserves further investigation. However, it is likely that greater job satisfaction results when the supervisor maintains a considerate business-like style of leadership without overemphasizing the necessity of getting the job done. If this is true, then job satisfaction should be high even in entry level jobs when supervisors adopt more considerate style of leadership.

In harmony with reports in previous studies is the present finding that females tend to report somewhat lower job satisfaction. Since sex

added 9% to the multiple correlation for satisfaction with opportunity for promotion and almost 3% to the one with satisfaction with the work, but added little to the other four job satisfaction measures, it is likely that male supervisors may hold different expectations of female workers so that they become less satisfied with the work. On the other hand, their perceptions that most supervisors are men may create feelings that their work is devalued with an end result of lower job satisfaction.

Although sex role identification measures contributed less to the prediction of job satisfaction than the considerate or people-oriented leadership style, their addition changed  $R^2$  significantly. The androgynous sex typed subordinates were more satisfied with the over-all job than the undifferentiated sex-typed. In addition, the results suggest that both the aggressive, dominant worker and the active, assertive subordinates have higher job satisfaction on some dimensions, the former with overall job and opportunities for promotion and the latter with co-workers. In addition, present results can be interpreted as supporting previous studies which suggest that masculinity of the leader is related to job satisfaction of their subordinates (Schein, 1973; Schein, 1975; Powell & Butterfield, 1979). Even the more aggressive, unemotionality reflected in the M-F scale added to the prediction of worker satisfaction. Together the two measures of masculine sex role identification suggest that male leaders with active, assertive characteristics elicit somewhat greater worker satisfaction with the work itself, the supervision, and the opportunities for promotion while male leaders who demonstrate more aggressive, dominant characteristics lead workers to express somewhat greater satisfaction with pay, to perceive less opportunity for promotion, and to be somewhat more

satisfied with the over-all job. For these male supervisors, feminine sex role identification was associated with lower subordinates' satisfaction with pay and higher satisfaction with co-workers. It may be that warm expressive characteristics tend to encourage workers to elicit sympathy among workers with the result that they focus upon the unfortunate elements of their jobs.

Since the present study was based upon data from a single job category, the findings should be interpreted with caution. To provide a greater understanding of the contributions of sex, sex role identification, and leadership style to job satisfaction, a more comprehensive study of varied job types should be conducted. In addition, experimental studies should be conducted to investigate job satisfaction as a function of an interaction between sex role identification of worker and supervisor.

Table 1  
Correlations, Means, and Standard Deviations for All Variables  
(N=9 supervisors; 42 workers)

| Variable                                    | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6   | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   |
|---------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| SUPERVISOR MEASURES:                        |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 1. Leader Style: People                     | -    |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2. Leader Style: Task                       | 35   | -    |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3. Supervisor PAQ: M-F                      | -16  | -34  | -    |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4. Supervisor PAQ: M                        | 25   | -43  | 85*  | -    |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5. Supervisor PAQ: F                        | -54  | -40  | 69*  | 47   | -    |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| WORKER MEASURES:                            |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 6. Sex                                      | 33*  | 24   | -12  | -05  | -15  | -   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. Sex Role Identity                        | 04   | 16   | -08  | -05  | -01  | 08  | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 8. Perceived Leader<br>Style: Consideration | 25   | 06   | 04   | 16   | 07   | .00 | -04  | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 9. Perceived Leader<br>Style: Initiation    | 24   | 16   | 09   | 18   | 07   | -08 | 03   | 79** | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 10. Worker PAQ: M-F                         | -05  | 08   | -27* | -28* | -12  | 11  | 10   | -15  | -17  | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 11. Worker PAQ: M                           | -14  | -04  | -09  | -10  | 09   | 13  | 74** | -22  | -24  | 24   | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 12. Worker PAQ: F                           | -03  | -18  | 24   | 25*  | 34*  | 15  | 54** | 04   | -10  | -02  | 55** | -    |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| WORKER JOB SATISFACTION                     |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 13. JDI: Work                               | 46** | 02   | 09   | 30*  | -04  | 26* | -01  | 58** | 43** | 02   | -13  | 03   | -    |      |      |      |      |      |
| 14. JDI: Pay                                | 27*  | 15   | -09  | -02  | -35* | -02 | -09  | 47** | 31*  | -20  | -22  | -06  | 36** | -    |      |      |      |      |
| 15. JDI: Promotion                          | 19   | -15  | -17  | 03   | -03  | 30* | 06   | 45** | 25*  | 19   | 06   | 21   | 62** | 26*  | -    |      |      |      |
| 16. JDI: Supervision                        | 29*  | 00   | 14   | 26*  | 05   | 00  | 00   | 74** | 54** | -17  | -20  | 01   | 56** | 35*  | 27*  | -    |      |      |
| 17. JDI: Co-Workers                         | 37** | 08   | 20   | 34*  | 11   | 10  | 15   | 36** | 26*  | -04  | 10   | 19   | 56** | 18   | 26*  | 32*  | -    |      |
| 18. JDI: Overall Job                        | 44** | 30*  | 10   | 22   | -05  | 18  | 30*  | 63** | 53** | -18  | 09   | 24   | 70** | 40** | 40** | 61** | 52** | -    |
| MEAN                                        | 14.8 | 12.5 | 18.2 | 20.2 | 21.3 | a   | 2.3  | 41.5 | 37.7 | 16.0 | 19.3 | 22.3 | 27.3 | 16.6 | 21.5 | 39.1 | 44.4 | 40.4 |
| STANDARD DEVIATION                          | 2.0  | 1.6  | 2.1  | 4.1  | 4.4  | -   | 1.1  | 11.5 | 12.0 | 3.8  | 3.5  | 5.1  | 10.9 | 11.4 | 15.1 | 11.6 | 9.8  | 11.6 |

\*  $p < .05$ , two tailed test; \*\*  $p < .01$ , two tailed test.

"a" denotes a dummy variable, sex (1=female; 2=male).

NOTE: Decimal point was omitted.

Table 2  
First Four Variables Entered into Stepwise Multiple Regression  
for Job Descriptive Index Measures

| Variable in Regression                          | Multiple<br>R | Multiple<br>R <sup>2</sup> | Multiple<br>R <sup>2</sup> Change | Beta  | Adjusted Multiple<br>R <sup>2</sup> |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| JDI: Work                                       |               |                            |                                   |       |                                     |
| 1. Perceived Leadership<br>Style: Consideration | .580          | .337                       | .337                              | .494  | .320                                |
| 2. Leader Style: People                         | .668          | .447                       | .109                              | .226  | .418                                |
| 3. Worker's Sex                                 | .688          | .474                       | .027                              | .203  | .432                                |
| 4. Supervisor PAQ: M                            | .710          | .504                       | .030                              | .183  | .451                                |
| JDI: Pay                                        |               |                            |                                   |       |                                     |
| 1. Perceived Leadership<br>Style: Consideration | .470          | .221                       | .221                              | .572  | .201                                |
| 2. Supervisor PAQ: F                            | .609          | .372                       | .150                              | -.783 | .339                                |
| 3. Supervisor PAQ: M-F                          | .644          | .415                       | .043                              | .381  | .368                                |
| 4. Leader Style: People                         | .665          | .443                       | .028                              | -.230 | .383                                |
| JDI: Promotion                                  |               |                            |                                   |       |                                     |
| 1. Perceived Leadership<br>Style: Consideration | .456          | .208                       | .208                              | .517  | .188                                |
| 2. Worker's Sex                                 | .550          | .302                       | .094                              | .351  | .266                                |
| 3. Leader Style: Task                           | .613          | .376                       | .073                              | -.300 | .326                                |
| 4. Worker's PAQ: M-F                            | .665          | .443                       | .067                              | .264  | .383                                |
| JDI: Supervision                                |               |                            |                                   |       |                                     |
| 1. Perceived Leadership<br>Style: Consideration | .746          | .557                       | .557                              | .839  | .546                                |
| 2. Supervisor PAQ: M                            | .761          | .579                       | .021                              | .206  | .557                                |
| 3. Perceived Leadership<br>Style: Initiation    | .766          | .587                       | .007                              | -.149 | .554                                |
| 4. Supervisor PAQ: F                            | .771          | .594                       | .007                              | -.100 | .551                                |
| JDI: Co-Workers                                 |               |                            |                                   |       |                                     |
| 1. Leader Style: People                         | .376          | .141                       | .141                              | .549  | .120                                |
| 2. Supervisor PAQ: F                            | .536          | .287                       | .145                              | .378  | .251                                |
| 3. Perceived Leadership<br>Style: Consideration | .565          | .319                       | .032                              | .236  | .266                                |
| 4. Worker's PAQ: M                              | .598          | .358                       | .038                              | .201  | .288                                |
| JDI: Overall Job                                |               |                            |                                   |       |                                     |
| 1. Perceived Leadership<br>Style: Consideration | .634          | .402                       | .402                              | .561  | .387                                |
| 2. Worker's Sex Role                            | .717          | .515                       | .112                              | .332  | .490                                |
| 3. Leader Style: People                         | .767          | .489                       | .074                              | .311  | .556                                |
| 4. Supervisor PAQ: M-F                          | .783          | .613                       | .024                              | .158  | .571                                |

Table 3  
Multiple R<sup>2</sup> Change Associated with Worker and Supervisor  
Measures for Each Job Descriptive Index Measure

| Variable                                  | Work | Pay   | Promotion | Supervision | Co-Workers | Overall Job |
|-------------------------------------------|------|-------|-----------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| <b>WORKER MEASURES:</b>                   |      |       |           |             |            |             |
| Perceived Leadership Style: Consideration | .337 | .221  | .208      | .557        | .032       | .402        |
| Perceived Leadership Style: Initiation    | -    | .010a | -         | .007a       | -          | -           |
| Sex                                       | .207 | -     | .094      | -           | -          | -           |
| Sex Role Identity                         | -    | -     | -         | -           | -          | .112        |
| PAQ: M-F                                  | -    | .015a | .067      | -           | -          | .011        |
| PAQ: M                                    | -    | -     | -         | -           | .038       | .010        |
| PAQ: F                                    | -    | -     | .018      | -           | -          | -           |
| <b>SUPERVISOR MEASURES:</b>               |      |       |           |             |            |             |
| Leader Style: People                      | .109 | .028  | .013a     | -           | .141       | .074        |
| Leader Style: Task                        | -    | -     | .073a     | -           | -          | .032        |
| PAQ: M-F                                  | -    | .043  | .038a     | -           | -          | .024        |
| PAQ: M                                    | .030 | -     | .010      | .021        | -          | -           |
| PAQ: F                                    | -    | .150a | -         | .007a       | .145       | -           |
| Multiple R at Last Step Reported Above    | .710 | .685  | .725      | .771        | .598       | .817        |

"a" denotes a negative beta weight.

NOTE: The multiple R<sup>2</sup> change was reported only if it was greater than 1% or was among the first four variables in the stepwise regression analysis.

## References

- Argyle, M., Gardner, G., & Cioffi, F. Supervisory methods related to productivity, absenteeism and labor turnover. Human Relations, 1958, 11, 23-40.
- Bass, B. M. Stogdill's handbook of leadership revised and expanded. New York: McMillan Publishing Company, 1981.
- Baumgartel, H. Leadership, motivations and attitudes in research laboratories. Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12, 24-31.
- Baumgartel, H. Leadership style as a variable in research administration. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1957, 2, 344-360.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. On the utility of alternate procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 196-205.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. The managerial grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.
- Brown, A. Reactions to leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1967, 3, 62-73.
- Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.
- Danielson, L. E., & Maier, N. R. F. Supervisory problems in decision making. Personnel Psychology, 1957, 10, 169-180.
- Field, H., & Caldwell, B. Sex of supervisor, sex of subordinate, and subordinate job satisfaction. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 4, 391-399.
- Fleishman, E. A., & Harris, E. F. Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. Personnel Psychology, 1962, 15, 43-56.
- Halpin, A. The leadership behavior and combat performance of aircraft commanders. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 19-22.
- Halpin, A. W., & Winer, B. J. A factorial study of the leader behavior description. Stogdill, R., & Coons, A. (Eds.). Leader behavior: Its description and Measurement. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.

- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. Development of the leader behavior description questionnaire. Stogdill, R., & Coons, A. (Eds.) Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.
- Hemphill, J. K. Leader behavior associated with the administrative reputations of college departments. Stogdill, R., & Coons, A. (Eds.) Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, R. H. Management of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Hulin, C. L., & Smith, P. C. Sex differences in job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 88-92.
- Inderlied, S., & Powell, G. Sex role identity and leadership style: Different labels for the same concept? Sex Roles, 1979, 5, 613-625.
- Indik, B. P., Seashore, S., & Georgopoulos, B. Relationships among criteria of job performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 195-202.
- Kelly, J. A., & Worrell, J. New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 1101-1115.
- Oaklander, H., & Fleishman, E. Patterns of leadership related to organizational stress in hospital settings. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1964, 8, 520-532.
- Osborn, R., & Vicars, W. Sex stereotypes: An artifact in leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction analysis? Academy of Management Journal, 1976, 19, 439-448.
- Patchen, M. Absence and employee feelings about fair treatment. Personnel Psychology, 1960, 13, 349-360.
- Petty, M., & Lee, G. Moderating effects of sex of supervisor and subordinate on relationships between supervisory behavior and subordinate satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 624-628.
- Pfeiffer, J., & Jones, J. A handbook of structured experiences for human relations training - Volume I. Iowa City, Iowa: University Associates Press, 1969.
- Powell, G., & Butterfield, D. A. The "good manager": Masculine or androgynous? Academy of Management Journal, 1979, 22, 395-403.

- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. Sex role stereotype and self concept in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.
- Sargent, A. The androgynous blend: Best of both worlds. Management Review, 1978, 67, 60-65.
- Sargent, A. The androgynous manager. New York: AMACOM Division of American Management Association, 1981.
- Schein, V. The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57, 95-100.
- Schein, V. Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 340-344.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., Metzcus, R., & Burden, L. Toward a particularistic approach to leadership style: Some findings. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 62-79.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969.
- Spector, A. J., Clark, R., & Glickman, A. S. Supervisory characteristics and attitudes of subordinates. Personnel Psychology, 1960, 13, 301-316.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions and correlates. Austin: Texas Press, 1978.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.